

CUSTOMER NO.: 24498

Ser. No. 10/031,151

Office Action dated: September 9, 2005

Response dated: December 6, 2005

PATENT

RCA 89,642

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1-9 are pending. No amendments to Claims 1-9 have been made as part of this response. New Claims 10 and 11 have been added herein. No new matter is believed to be added by the new claims.

Claims 1-9 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knowles (U.S. Patent Publication No 2003/0079227) in view of Kim (U.S. Patent 6,519,412). Applicants submit, that for at least the reasons discussed below, Claims 1-11 are patentable over Knowles in view of Kim.

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, all of the recited claim limitations must be taught or suggested in the prior art. *See, MPEP 2143.03; see also, In re. Royka, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974).* Applicants submit the cited art fails to teach, or suggest, each of the recited limitations of any of the pending claims.

The present invention relates to a method and apparatus for providing conditional access to programming that is available from multiple sources of programming, e.g., terrestrial and satellite broadcast sources. *See, e.g., page 2, lines 6-7, and 11-12.* Conventionally, systems for receiving terrestrial and satellite broadcasts each use their own passwords. *See, e.g., page 1, lines 27-31.* The present invention addresses this shortcoming by enabling a user to enter a single password to access programming from multiple sources of programming, (such as activating both satellite and terrestrial components of an integrated television system). *See, page 2, lines 8-15.*

Claim 1 recites:

Apparatus for integrating passwords for accessing programming from multiple sources, the apparatus comprising:
 a memory for storing a first password associated with a first source of programming;
 removable memory for storing a second password associated with a second source of programming;
 temporary memory for temporarily storing said first password during use; and

CUSTOMER NO.: 24498

Ser. No. 10/031,151

Office Action dated: September 9, 2005

Response dated: December 6, 2005

PATENT

RCA 89,642

means for replacing said first password in said temporary storage with said second password to enable said second password to allow access to programming from said first and second sources.

In contrast, Knowles and Kim fail, in any combination, to teach or suggest each of the elements of Claim 1, and thus fail to render Claim 1 unpatentably obvious. Neither reference teaches or suggests first and second memories for storing passwords associated with *first and second sources of programming*, respectively. The apparatus of *Knowles merely operates with a single source of programming*. That is, Knowles apparently stores passwords associated with different MPEG program streams, which program streams, however, emanate from a single source of programming at different memory locations in a single memory, (namely, direct memory access (DMA) 7 of Fig. 1B).

More particularly, although the Knowles reference terms the separate MPEG streams as "sources", a detailed reading of Knowles makes clear that separate MPEG streams cannot properly be equated to the claimed "sources of programming". Nowhere does Knowles teach reception or use of content from first and second sources of programming (e.g., satellite and terrestrial source of programming), as recited by Claim 1. To the contrary, Knowles appears to receive programming content *from only a single source of programming*, as it includes a single depacketizer 2, decoder 3 and IPG data extractor 4 feeding tuners 11, 12, 13, in-turn feeding MPEG decoders 14, 15, 16. *See, Fig. 1B; see also, par. 75.* Thus, a single source of digital television programming provides a feed to a set-top box, which merely provides access to the multiple MPEG streams thereof for televisions 17, 18, 19.

In contradistinction, Claim 1 recites, "a memory for storing a first password associated with *a first source of programming*" [e.g., a terrestrial source of programming]; [and] "removable memory for storing a second password associated with *a second source of programming*" [e.g., a satellite source of programming]. The secondary reference Kim fails to remedy at least this shortcoming of Knowles. Instead, Kim is merely relied upon in the Office action for its alleged teaching of a memory being removable.

CUSTOMER NO.: 24498

Ser. No. 10/031,151

Office Action dated: September 9, 2005

Response dated: December 6, 2005

PATENT

RCA 89,642

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Knowles and Kim, in any combination, fail to teach or suggest each of the recited limitations of Claim 1, and hence, as a matter of law, fail to render the same unpatentably obvious. In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and removal of the rejection of Claim 1 is respectfully requested. Applicants also request reconsideration and removal of the rejections of Claims 2-4 as well, at least by virtue of these claims' ultimate dependency upon a patentably distinct base Claim 1.

Regarding independent method Claim 5, it recites:

A method for integrating passwords for accessing multiple sources of programming in an integrated television system, the method comprising:
 processing a first password if the integrated television system receives an access card containing said first password, where said first password enables access to *said multiple sources of programming*; and
 processing a second password if the integrated television system fails to receive the access card.
 (emphasis added)

Like Claim 1, Applicants submit Knowles and Kim fail to teach or suggest processing any password that enables access to *multiple sources of programming*, – and clearly fails to teach processing first and second passwords, where the first password enables access to *multiple sources of programming*, as is recited by Claim 5. As discussed above with regard to Claim 1, the apparatus of *Knowles merely operates with a single source of programming*. That is, Knowles apparently stores passwords associated with different MPEG streams from a single source of programming at different memory locations in a single memory, but does not teach or suggest accessing program information from multiple sources of programming (i.e. multiple broadcast sources) in the manner recited in present Claim 5.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Knowles and Kim, in any combination, fail to teach or suggest each of the recited steps of Claim 5, and hence, as a matter of law, fail to render the same unpatentably obvious. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and removal of the rejection of Claim 5 for at least the reasons set forth above. Applicants also request

CUSTOMER NO.: 24498

Ser. No. 10/031,151

Office Action dated: September 9, 2005

Response dated: December 6, 2005

**PATENT
RCA 89,642**

reconsideration and removal of the rejections of Claims 6-9, at least by virtue of these claims' ultimate dependency upon a patentably distinct base Claim 5.

Newly added Claims 10 and 11 are deemed to be distinguishable over Knowles and Kim, in any combination, for at least the reasons set forth above.

The above notwithstanding, new claims 10-11 include further features and limitations that are neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited references of record. By way of example only, new Claims 10 and 11 find support on page 3, in lines 5-6 (*"FIG. 1 depicts a high-level diagram of an integrated television system 100 that is capable of receiving television signals from a plurality of sources."*) and in lines 9-13 (*"[a]s such, the system 100 receives signals from both a satellite antenna 106 and a terrestrial antenna 104. The signals from the antennas 106 and 104 are separately processed respectively by a satellite television receiver 110 and a terrestrial television receiver 108. The received signals from either source are displayed on a monitor."*).

Knowles clearly fails to teach or suggest separate antennas for receiving signals from separate sources of programming as recited by new Claim 10. Furthermore, Knowles provides no teach whatsoever for receiving signals from separate antennas corresponding to separate sources of programming as recited by new Claim 11. The Kim reference fails to remedy the above-identified deficiencies of Knowles. For at least these additional reasons, allowance of new claims 10-11 is respectfully requested.

CUSTOMER NO.: 24498

Ser. No. 10/031,151

Office Action dated: September 9, 2005

Response dated: December 6, 2005

PATENT

RCA 89,642

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicants' attorney at (609) 734-6815, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

No fee is believed due. However, if a fee is due, please charge the additional fee for the filing of this response to Deposit Account No. 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,

AARON HAL DINWIDDIE ET AL.

By:



Paul P. Kiel

Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 40,677

(609) 734-6815

PPK:pdf

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing Inc.
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

December 7, 2005